

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **21 June 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) based on Baisley et al. (USPN 6,415,299, hereinafter “Baisley”). Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) based on Ring et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0102328, hereinafter “Ring”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-8 asserting that the claimed invention is not directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant has changed “method” to “computer implemented method” in these claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 as presently amended is in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend upon claim 1, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. §101 and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §102(e)

Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22-24 as being unpatentable over Baisley and claims 1-24 as being anticipated by Ring.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Baisely nor Ring discloses a customizable metadata merging framework for objects in a database wherein the metadata provides a data structure that **describes** the database objects and is **distinct from** the database objects themselves. In fact, Baisely teaches away from metadata merging by focusing entirely on object merging. *See* Figs. 5C-5D of

Baisely. Similarly, in Ring the objects are folders to be merged rather than data that describes attributes about the folders. *See* Figs. 9a-b, 11a-c, and Fig. 13 of Ring.

Applicant uses the term **metadata** as it is commonly understood in the computer industry: data used to describe an object. For example the metadata “zip code” might be used to describe the data object “95616.” Metadata provides important distinctions in the merging process. For example, without metadata, the data object “95616” might be interpreted as an “integer” representing ninety-five thousand five-hundred and sixteen rather than a zip code.

In contrast to Baisely and Ring, the present inventive system provides a metadata merging method. The benefit of facilitating metadata merging is that it can save time and effort in an otherwise manual process.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that metadata provides a separate data structure that describes database objects and is distinct from the database objects themselves. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0001] and [0003] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-12 and 14-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-20 and 22-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 31 August 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com